

Vanzolini, P.E. 1986. Addenda and corrigenda to the *Catalogue of Neotropical Squamata*. *Smithsonian Herpetological Service*, 70: 1–25.

(2) Hobart M. Smith

*Department of Environmental, Population and Organismic Biology,
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0334, U.S.A.*

Edwin L. Bell

*Department of Biology, Albright College, Reading, Pennsylvania 19612-5234,
U.S.A.*

Neither of us is an expert in the taxonomy of South American lizards; in the taxonomic placement of *Tropidolepis bellii* Gray, 1831 we were merely following literature allocation. Inasmuch as Dr Etheridge is an expert in the field, we would not contest his allocation of the name (his comment above).

Our involvement in the names pertaining to this case is a product of accounting for all the species-group names proposed in or applicable to the genus *Sceloporus* Wiegmann, 1828, a project that we have been working on for several years. A number of such names were at one time proposed in the nominal genus *Tropidolepis* Cuvier, 1829, hence our concern with these (para. 1 of the application). Their proper allocation had to be established.

With regard to *Liolaemus bellii* Gray, 1845, although stability of nomenclature in the sense of established usage cannot be viewed as at stake, in another sense stability is involved: the proper interpretation of the fact that Ortiz's dissertation was not published. Nuñez & Jaksic (1992) regarded Ortiz's synonymizing of *altissimus* with *bellii* as invalid because it was never published. Nevertheless, as pointed out by Etheridge above, several authors in several works have accepted Ortiz's conclusion. It would help nomenclatural stability considerably if the Commission would make it clear that a decision on the proper name for the species concerned cannot hinge on the failure of Ortiz's dissertation to be published; his conclusion was published subsequently by others. We support the placement of the specific name of *Liolaemus bellii* Gray, 1845 on the Official List.

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domestic animals

(Case 3010; see BZN 53: 28–37, 125, 192–200, 286–288)

(1) Robin Pellew

*World Wide Fund for Nature, WWF-UK, Panda House, Weyside Park,
Catteshall Lane, Godalming, Surrey GU7 1XR, U.K.*

I write as Director of WWF-UK.

I support the proposal to conserve the 15 mammal specific names for wild species which are cited in this application. Stability in the nomenclature is a prerequisite of

conservation and for this reason I urge that confirmation be given to the majority usage by adoption of the first available specific name based on a wild population for the 15 species.

(2) Elizabeth Cary Mungall

Department of Biology, Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas 76204, U.S.A.
(presently at 7926 South Lagoon Drive, Panama City Beach, Florida 32408-5306, U.S.A.)

I support the application by Gentry, Clutton-Brock & Groves to conserve the usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species but antedated by, or contemporary with, names based on domestic animals assumed to be their derivatives. Among the advantages pointed out by the authors, this adoption of the first available specific name based on a wild population would confirm majority usage. Although most wild taxa and their domestic counterparts have the same scientific name (for example, *Oryctolagus cuniculus* (Linnaeus, 1758) for the wild and domestic rabbit, and *Columba livia* Gmelin, 1789 for the rock dove and domestic pigeon) a few, including these 15, traditionally do not.

Both stability in nomenclature and different scientific names for related wild and domestic forms are distinct advantages for investigators like myself who engage in ethological studies. Ethology is a comparative science. As works by leaders in this field, such as ungulate specialist Fritz R. Walther, illustrate (e.g. Walther, 1974, 1979, 1984), wild species and domestic forms are studied and discussed on equal terms. This promotes inspection of relationships in which domestication is not the central issue at the same time that it facilitates discussions on the process of domestication and its effects. Thus, Walther (1984) used wild American bison *Bison bison* (Linnaeus, 1758) and Marco Polo sheep *Ovis ammon poli* Blyth, 1841 and domestic Camargue cattle *Bos taurus* Linnaeus, 1758 as examples in a discussion of scraping the ground. Swiss zoo director Heini Hediger included the extinct aurochs *Bos primigenius* Bojanus, 1827, European bison *Bison bonasus* (Linnaeus, 1758) and domestic cattle *Bos taurus* among sets of wild and domestic forms used as examples in discussions of domestication and its effects (Hediger, 1964, 1968, 1969). Cases like these, in which clear distinction between the wild and domestic forms is critically important, are inherent in ethology. No matter which fashion in naming domestic animals is currently being followed, minimizing confusion over which form is meant will promote useful discussion.

Applied ethology also benefits from retaining the traditionally separate names set out in the application. A distinction between wild and domestic forms helps to reduce confusion when animal owners request advice. Is it the wild or the domestic form which is referred to? What management options would be most appropriate? This is not just a question involving zoo personnel or those in the pet trade. In addition to import and export regulations, I have been especially aware of this need for clarity among owners of ungulates of foreign origin kept on ranches in the Americas (see Mungall & Sheffield, 1994). Ranches raising 'exotics' of this sort are most prevalent in the state of Texas in the U.S.A. There, the latest state census (see Mungall, 1994) estimated 182,008 head of foreign wildlife, including the wild bezoar goat *Capra aegagrus* Erxleben, 1777 and the guanaco *Lama guanicoe* (Müller, [1776]), and